

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner maintained his rejections of claims 1-24 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In particular, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 20, 22, and 24 as unpatentable over Teraoka et al., "A Network Architecture Providing Host Migration Transparency" in view of Short et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892. Claims 3 and 10 were rejected as unpatentable over Teraoka et al. and Short et al. in further view of Forman et al., "The Challenges of Mobile Computing." Claims 5 and 12 were rejected as unpatentable over Francis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,331,637, in view of Teraoka et al. and Short et al. Claims 6, 13, 16, 19, and 23 were rejected as unpatentable over Teraoka et al. and Short et al. in further view of V-One Corporation, "V-One's Smartgate VPN." Finally, claim 21 was rejected as unpatentable over Teraoka et al.

Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration of the section 103(a) rejections of claims 1-24. In particular, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made at least because the reference or references, taken alone or combined, do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims, as required by M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 20, 22, and 24 as unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892. However, the teachings of Teraoka et al. and Short et al., taken alone or together, fail to disclose or suggest several elements recited in amended claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 20, 22, and 24.

Teraoka et al., the primary reference cited to reject all of the claims, discloses a system including a host that has two addresses - a virtual address and a physical address. Teraoka et al., p. 212, col. 1, ll. 21-25. A host's virtual address does not change even though the host may change physical addresses. Id., p. 212, col. 1, ll. 25-30. To permit this host movement, the system of Teraoka et al. provides address mapping between a host's virtual address and physical address. Id., p. 213, col. 1, ll. 45-56. When a host moves to a new physical address, it sends a packet to its native network. The packet contains the host's virtual address and its new physical address. Id., p. 214, col. 1, ll. 2-5. After the host's move, a sender that does not know the host's physical address may address a message to the host's virtual address, meaning that the message is sent to the host's native network. Id., p. 214, col. 1, ll. 15-22. A router at the host's native network receives the message with the incorrect address, maps the incorrect address to the host's new physical address, and sends the message to the host at the new physical address. Id., p. 213, col. 1, ll. 16-25; p. 214, col. 1, ll. 25-30. If the host responds with a message to the sender, then the sender may obtain the host's physical address from the message and thereafter send messages to the physical address of the host. Id., p. 213, col. 1, ll. 33-36.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, a series of packets sent between two programs: a source node and a destination node. When the address of the destination node changes, the destination node sends an update packet containing the new address of the destination node to the source node. In response to receiving the update packet, the source node stores the new address of the destination node. A second

packet is then sent by the source node to the destination node by using the stored new address.

Sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node from the destination node to the source node is not taught or suggested by the cited references. In the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the ConnectionNotification sent by a migrating host in Teraoka et al. is an update packet. However, the reference clearly states that the ConnectionNotification packet is sent to the migrating host's native network, not a source node as claimed. The ConnectionNotification packet of the reference is used by gateway routers to redirect messages that are addressed to the host's old, incorrect address. (Teraoka et al., p. 214, col. 1, ll. 2-26.) This is not the same as sending an update packet from a destination node to a source node, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, the reference explicitly teaches away from a source node responding to receiving the update packet by storing the new address. Not only does the source node of Teraoka et al. not receive an update packet, the reference states plainly that the sender knows the host's virtual address **but does not know its new physical address**. The sender must send a packet using the host's virtual address so that the packet is directed to the host's native network, where it is re-directed to the new physical address. (Id., p. 214, col. 1, ll. 15-19; p. 213, col. 1, ll. 16-25.) Thus, the sender of the reference cannot store the host's new address in response to receiving an update packet, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons given above, Teraoka et al. fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 1. Short et al. does not correct any of the deficiencies of

Teraoka et al. described above. Short et al. discloses a portable router for connecting to a network and is cited only for the teaching that routers can be implemented in software and/or hardware. Short et al., col. 2, ll. 29-30. Because neither Teraoka et al. nor Short et al., taken alone or combined, teaches or suggests several elements recited in claim 1, the claim is not obvious over the references and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 8, 15, 18, and 22 contain recitations similar to those included in claim 1 and are allowable over Teraoka et al. and Short et al. at least for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2, 4, and 7 depend from claim 1. Dependent claims 9, 11, and 14 depend from claim 8. Claim 17 depends from claim 15. Claim 20 depends from claim 18. Finally, claim 24 depends from claim 22. At least because of their dependence on nonobvious claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 22, dependent claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 17, 20, and 24 are nonobvious. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 20, 22, and 24.

Claims 3 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 8 respectively and were rejected as unpatentable over Teraoka et al. and Short et al. in further view of Forman et al., "The Challenges of Mobile Computing." At least because of their dependence on nonobvious claims 1 and 8, dependent claims 3 and 10 are nonobvious. Furthermore, Forman et al. does not cure the deficiencies in Teraoka et al. and Short et al. described above. For example, Forman et al. does not teach or suggest, among other things, sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node from the destination node to the source node, as recited in claims 3 and 10 by virtue of their dependence on

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

claims 1 and 8 respectively. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections of 3 and 10.

Claims 5 and 12 depend from claims 1 and 8 respectively and were rejected as unpatentable over Francis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,331,637, in view of Teraoka et al. and Short et al. At least because of their dependence on nonobvious claims 1 and 8, dependent claims 5 and 12 are nonobvious. Furthermore, Francis et al. does not cure the deficiencies in Teraoka et al. and Short et al. described above. For example, Francis et al. does not teach or suggest, among other things, sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node from the destination node to the source node, as recited by claims 5 and 12 by virtue of their dependence on claims 1 and 8 respectively. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections of 5 and 12.

Claims 6, 13, 16, 19, and 23 depend from claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 22 respectively and were rejected as unpatentable over Teraoka et al. and Short et al. in further view of V-One Corporation, "V-One's Smartgate VPN." At least because of their dependence on nonobvious claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 22, dependent claims 6, 13, 16, 19, and 23 are nonobvious. Furthermore, "V-One Corporation" does not cure the deficiencies in Teraoka et al. and Short et al. described above. For example, "V-One Corporation" does not teach or suggest, among other things, sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node from the destination node to the source node, as recited in claims 6, 13, 16, 19, and 23 by virtue of their dependence on claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 22 respectively. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections of claim 6, 13, 16, 19, and 23.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Claim 21 was rejected as unpatentable over Teraoka et al. However, claim 21 contains similar recitations to claim 1 and is allowable over Teraoka et al. at least for the reasons given above with regard to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-24.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 26, 2004

By: 

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com